

**Applicant:** Nygaard et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/743,538

**Amendments to Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figure 1 and Figure 2. The attached sheets, which include Figure 1 and Figure 2, replace the original sheets including Figure 1 and Figure 2. In Figure 1 and Figure 2, reference numeral 50 has been added to reference the roller or ball bearing located at the free end of the pivotable arm. Support for this feature is found on page 3, lines 17-19.

**Applicant: Nygaard et al.**  
**Application No.: 10/743,538**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Pursuant to the foregoing Amendment, Claims 14-18 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-13 have been canceled. New claims 14-18 have been added to more distinctly claim subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. In the specification, the paragraph beginning on page 3, line 11 has been amended to include reference numeral 50. In the drawings, Figure 1 and Figure 2 have been amended to include reference numeral 50. Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

**Objections to the Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the drawings failed to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. A replacement sheet including Figure 1 and Figure 2, which has been revised to include reference numeral 50 indicating a roller located at the free end of the pivotable sear is submitted herewith. No new matter has been added by this amendment. The withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

**Applicant:** Nygaard et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/743,538

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-7, 10, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-7 and 10-13 have been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,718,187 to Blake (hereinafter "Blake"). Applicant submits that new claims 14-18 are patentable over the cited reference.

Claim 14 of the present application recites a firing assembly for an air gun comprising a valve, a ram for actuating the valve, a pivotable sear for holding and releasing the ram, a pivotable arm for holding and releasing the pivotable sear, a solenoid for pivoting the pivoting arm, and a trigger for actuating the solenoid. In contrast, Blake discloses a trigger for a weapon such as a rifle having a mechanical trigger, with means to remotely command the weapon to discharge. Blake fails to teach or suggest a valve for controlling the flow of compressed air, or a ram for engaging the valve. Blake is directed towards a traditional rifle, not an air gun as claimed in the present invention. Furthermore, as the Examiner admits on page 6

**Applicant:** Nygaard et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/743,538

of the Office Action, Blake fails to disclose a pivotable arm having a roller or ball bearing on its free end. Therefore, Blake fails to teach every element claimed in the amended claims.

For the reasons presented above, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blake in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,908,970 to Bell (hereinafter "Bell"). While claim 7 has been cancelled, the Applicants respectfully disagree.

Neither Blake nor Bell, taken alone or together, teach all of the elements as claimed in the amended claims of the present application.

The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,594,240 to Wells (hereinafter "Wells") in view of Blake. While claim 13 has been cancelled, the Applicants respectfully disagree.

Neither Wells nor Blake, taken alone or together, teaches all of the elements as claimed in claim 14 of the present application. For the reasons presented above, Blake fails to teach of the elements as claimed in claim 14 of the present application. While Wells is directed to air guns generally, the teachings of Wells would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the present invention when

**Applicant:** Nygaard et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/743,538

combined with the teachings of Blake. The claimed limitations of a roller on the free end of the pivotable arm, a valve for controlling the flow of compressed air to a firing chamber, and a ram for engaging the valve, are not taught by the cited references. Nor is there any motivation in the references to combine them in a manner that produces Applicants' claimed invention.

For the reasons presented above, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**Conclusion**


If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

**Applicant:** Nygaard et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/743,538

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 14-18, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Nygaard et al.

By   
Robert D. Leonard  
Registration No. 57,204

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

RDL/dmm